

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVIII, No. 9

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1924

WHOLE No. 486

## American Academy in Rome

### School of Classical Studies

SUMMER SESSION, JULY 6--AUGUST 14, 1925

Teachers and Graduate Students in the Classics, History, and related subjects are invited to attend the Third Summer Session of the School of Classical Studies in the American Academy in Rome.

The work will be conducted by Professor Grant Showerman, of the University of Wisconsin, who was Annual Professor in the School in 1922-1923 and Director of the Summer Sessions of 1923 and 1924.

The subjects of study will be:

- (1) History of Rome the City.
- (2) Monuments of ancient, early Christian, mediaeval, Renaissance, and modern Rome.
- (3) Life and Letters in the Classical period.
- (4) A limited number of sites outside of Rome.

The whole work will consist of one comprehensive and unified course designed to communicate a general acquaintance with the city in all its phases from the first settlement to the present time, and a special acquaintance with it in the times of Cicero, Caesar, Vergil, and the first Emperors.

The lectures will be given in the Academy building, before the monuments, and at the sites. Independent reading and written work will be required of all. The Academy certificate recommending a credit of 6 hours in American Graduate Schools will be presented on completion of the work by examination.

Living rates will approximate \$1.60 a day. Total necessary expenses, including voyage from and to New York, and the Academy fee of \$50, may be calculated at about \$500.

*For further details write to Professor Grant Showerman,  
410 North Butler Street, Madison, Wisconsin*

## A COLLEGE PROFESSOR'S VERDICT

"Place's Second Year Latin is a good step in the right direction. The teachers of the country seem to be pretty generally agreed on two points: first, that the amount of grammar included in the typical first year book is more than can be done in one year; and second, that much easy, interesting, and worthwhile reading material should precede the attacking of Caesar's Gallic War. Dr. Place's two-book series is an evident effort to meet this growing demand, inasmuch as some of the more difficult principles of syntax are postponed till the second year and an unusual amount of reading material is provided in the first year book.

I commend also the working out of the first twenty chapters of the Gallic War in a form comparable to that employed in the "chapters" or lessons found in the first book. I heartily approve of the use of selections from the seven books of Caesar, rather than the traditional use of four straight books with perhaps selections at the end."

*Many Other Teachers Write to the Same Effect*

Place's Beginning Latin ..... \$1.40

Place's Second Year Latin ..... \$1.68

By PERLEY OAKLAND PLACE, Litt.D., Professor of Latin, Syracuse University

## AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

*"The glory that was Greece*

*The grandeur that was Rome—"*

These things are remote indeed from the mind of the average High School boy as he sits at his ink-stained desk with a dog-eared copy of Caesar propped open before him.

## THE ENCHANTED PAST

By JEANNETTE RECTOR HODGDON

THIS book gives the Classics a new meaning and interest for American boys and girls. It makes them appreciate the value of the precious gifts the past has left us. It shows them how what took place in America twenty-five years ago has had less effect on their lives than what took place in Asia twenty-five hundred years ago. It describes vividly, yet simply, the customs, art, literature, and religion of the great peoples of the ancient world—the Greeks, the Romans, the Hindus, the Egyptians, the Chinese, the Babylonians, the Hebrews, the Persians. Numerous quotations and illustrations add to the interest of the account.

70 Fifth Ave.

*Ginn and Company*

New York

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVIII, No. 9

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1924

WHOLE No. 486

## JUVENAL 7.150-168 ANCIENT ORATORY

In his Seventh Satire Juvenal discusses the small returns that come from devotion to literature. Poets grow old in poverty, cursing their genius (1-97). Historians fare no better than poets (93-104); most lawyers receive next to nothing (105-149). Then comes the following passage:

Declamare doces? O ferrea pectora Vetti,  
cum perimit saevos classis numerosa tyrannos,  
nam quaecumque sedens modo legerat, haec eadem  
stans  
perferet atque eadem cantabit versibus isdem;  
occidit miseris crambe repetita magistros.  
Quis color, et quod sit causae genus, atque ubi summa  
quaestio, quae veniant diversae forte sagittae,  
nosse volunt omnes, mercedem solvere nemo.  
"Mercedem appellas? Quid enim scio?" "Culpa  
docentis  
scilicet arguitur, quod laevae parte mamillae  
nil salit Arcadico iuveni, cuius mihi sexta  
quaque die miserum dirus caput Hannibal implet,  
quidquid id est de quo deliberat, an petat urbem  
a Cannis, an post nimbos et fulmina cautus  
circumagat madidas a tempestate cohortes.  
Quantum vis stipulare et protinus accipe—quid do,  
ut totiens illum pater audiat?"—haec alii sex  
vel plures uno conclamant ore sophistae  
et veras agitant lites raptore relicto. . . .

A rough version of verses 150-157, the part of the passage in which I am especially interested, would run somewhat as follows:

'Do you teach declamation <rhetic>? O iron is the soul of Vettius, when his crowded class is in the business of killing off<sup>1</sup> merciless tyrants! For, whatever it was that the pupils read in their seats, this very same matter they will, on their feet, pursue to the bitter end, droning out the selfsame stuff in the selfsame verses. The everlasting serving-up of the selfsame dish is death to the poor teacher. What complexion is to be given to a case, to what *genus* <dicendi> it belongs, where the main point <the crux> lies, what shafts are coming from the other side, every blessed soul wants to know, but not a soul is willing to pay <for the knowledge>.'

According to J. B. Mayor, on verse 155, and A. Gudeman, on Tacitus, Dialogus 20, the word *color* had a technical sense in post-classical Latin. Corresponding to the Greek *χρῶμα*, it denoted the "varnish, gloss or color by which the accused endeavors to palliate, the accuser to aggravate, the allowed facts of a case". These *colores* were often collected by rhetoricians. The elder Seneca, for example, arranged his Controversiae under three heads, *sententiae*, *divisiones*, *colores*. We might define *colores*, then, as 'ways of making the best or the worst, as the case may be, of a given set of facts'. In this meaning *color* may well be represented by 'complexion', and, since *sit* is a deliberative subjunctive in a dependent question,

<sup>1</sup>Mark the tense of *perimit*.

we may render *quis color*. . . *sit* by 'what complexion is to be given to a case', i. e. how one shall put the best face on his own case or the worst face on his adversary's.

I am, however, more concerned at present with the expression *quod sit causae genus* (155).

Since Aristotle's time *orationes* have been, for the most part, divided into *tria genera* (for Aristotle's views see, below, the quotation from Professor Baldwin's book). For echoes of those views in the pages of Latin writers compare e.g. Cicero, De Inventione 1.7.

Aristoteles autem, qui huic arti < = rhetoric > plurima adiumenta atque ornamenta subministravit, *tribus in generibus rerum* versari rhetoris officium putavit, *demonstrativo, deliberativo, iudiciali*. *Demonstrativum* est, quod tribuitur in alicuius certae personae laudem aut vituperationem; *deliberativum*, quod, positum in disceptatione civili, habet in se sententiae dictionem; *iudiciale*, quod, positum in iudicio, habet in se accusationem et defensionem aut petitionem et recusationem.

In 3.4 Quintilian discusses the *tria genera orationum*. In § 1 he says:

'It is a question whether there are three or more than three <genera orationum>. Certainly almost all writers, at least those of the highest authority among the ancients, have acquiesced in this tripartite division, following the opinion of Aristotle. . . .

Quintilian then proceeds to argue the question as to whether there are *three genera*, or more than three. His conclusion is given in §§ 12-15:

. . . Est igitur, ut dixi, unum genus quo laus et vituperatio continetur, sed est appellatum a parte meliore *laudativum*; idem alii *demonstrativum* vocant. . . . Alterum est *deliberativum*, tertium *iudiciale*. Ceterae species <'species', 'kinds', of oratory> in haec tria incident genera, nec invenietur ex his ulla in qua non laudare ac vituperare, suadere ac dissuadere, intendere quid <'to force some charge home'> vel depellere debeamus.

Quintilian presently discusses the *tria genera* in detail: the *demonstrativum* in 3.7, the *deliberativum* in 3.8, and the *iudiciale* in 3.9-11.

In 1893, Mr. Ralph Curtis Ringwalt, then a member of the Department of English, Columbia University, published a book entitled Modern American Oratory (Henry Holt and Company. Pp. vi + 334). The contents of this book, little known, I venture to say, to classical students, are well worth indicating in full:

The Theory of Oratory, I. I. What Oratory Is <3-7>, II. The Divisions of Oratory <7-9>, III. Deliberative Oratory <9-16>, IV. Forensic Oratory <16-23>, V. Demonstrative Oratory <24-43: The Eulogy (27-30), The Commemorative Oration (30-35), The Platform Oration (35-40), The After-dinner Address (40-43)>, VI. Pulpit Oratory <43-53>; II. VII. The Divisions of the Oration <53-55>; VIII. Introduction <55-60>, IX. Narration <60-



66>, X. Partition <66-75>, XI. Discussion <75-82>, XII. Conclusion <83-85>, XIII. The Preparation of Speeches <85-90>; Orations; Deliberative Oratory, Carl Schurz: General Amnesty <93-130>; Forensic Oratory, Jeremiah S. Black: The Right to Trial by Jury—Ex-Parte Milligan <131-181>; Demonstrative Oratory, The Eulogy—Wendell Phillips: Daniel O'Connell <182-192>, The Commemorative Oration—Chauncey M. Depew: The One Hundredth Anniversary of the Inauguration of President Washington <220-255>, The Platform Oration—George William Curtis: The Leadership of Educated Men <256-277>, The After-dinner Address—Henry W. Grady: The New South <278-291>; Pulpit Oratory, Henry Ward Beecher: The Sepulcher in the Garden <292-311>; Notes <313-329>; Bibliography of Orators and Oratory <331-334>.

Of the divisions of oratory, Mr. Ringwalt writes clearly (7-9):

... Although variously named by different writers these divisions <of oratory>—a single addition excepted—have always been intrinsically the same: they have been based on one of two points of view, either upon the attitude of an audience towards a speech, or upon the purpose of the speaker, and usually upon the former. For example, Aristotle, who laid the foundation of the oratorical art so deeply that those who have followed have done little more than amplify his ideas, finds three attitudes in an audience, and upon these he bases his divisions of oratory. He says that audiences are either judges of things lying in the past, as are members of judicial tribunals; or judges of things lying in the future, as are members of assemblies and deliberative bodies; or critics, as are those who estimate only the ability of a speaker or the power and charm of a speech. Then, from this analysis he draws the conclusion that there can be only three kinds of speeches—judicial, deliberative, and epideictic, the oration of display. To this division, the birth of Christianity, and the part played in the spreading of its doctrine by spoken discourse has added a new, a fourth type of oratory; but with this exception, Aristotle's classification is as valuable to-day as it was two thousand years ago. We may therefore adopt it, making the addition which has just been suggested, and changing a little, though somewhat arbitrarily, the nomenclature. For judicial, a word which is now open to several significations, the term forensic, designating more univocally the oratory of the bar, may be substituted; and in place of epideictic, the word demonstrative, which was adopted by Roman rhetoricians, and since almost universally by other writers, is probably better. We shall then have four great divisions of oratory, as follows: (1) deliberative, the oratory of the assembly; (2) forensic, the oratory of the bar; (3) demonstrative (also called occasional), the oratory of display; and (4) pulpit, the oratory of the Christian Church.

Turning then to the consideration of these several classes, Mr. Ringwalt defines (9) the *genus deliberativum* more closely, as follows:

... Any speech before a number of people who listen as judges, where the object of the speaker is to induce his hearers to accept or reject a given policy for the future, may be called a deliberative speech. Thus to this class belong not only most congressional efforts, but speeches in conventions, those on the hustings, those in public meetings of many sorts, as well as those before synods and conferences. When a member of a board of directors presents to his colleagues ideas concerning a business plan, his remarks also fall under this category. Evidently, then, the division of oratory before us is much broader than might seem from the first definition; it is, in fact, as extensive as is the range of topics which men may be called to deliberate upon.

On page 24 Mr. Ringwalt speaks of the inappropriateness of the name 'demonstrative', but declares himself unable to find a better. He proceeds thus:

... The province of demonstrative oratory was said by the ancients to be the praise or censure of persons or things, or, to put it differently, panegyric or invective. It applied to all such speeches "as having no reference either to deliberation for the future, or adjudication upon the past, were engrossed with the present moment; and were usually adapted more to exhortation than to business; to show rather than to action". The field thus indicated is uncommonly large; the popular lecture, the dedicatory or anniversary address, the commencement oration, the after-dinner speech—all come under the category. The purpose of all these is not to convince, so much as to charm the senses with words that are fit and adequate.

On page 27 Mr. Ringwalt dwells on four subdivisions of the Demonstrative Oration: (1) the eulogy, (2) the commemorative oration, (3) the platform oration, and (4) the after-dinner speech.

Recently, my friend and colleague, Dr. Charles Sears Baldwin, Professor of Rhetoric and English Composition at Barnard College, published, as the result of many years of devoted study, a book entitled *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic Interpreted from Representative Works* (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1924. Pp. xi + 261). This book will be reviewed, presently, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY by a competent critic. Meantime, I want to call attention to the striking fact that a second time a Columbia University professor who is not primarily a student of the Classics is making an important contribution to the understanding of ancient rhetoric. I shall give, at present, just one quotation from Professor Baldwin's book, a passage bearing on the matters discussed above.

This passage, to be found on pages 14-17, is the concluding portion of Professor Baldwin's discussion of Aristotle's presentation of rhetoric, in his *Rhetorica*, Book I (the footnotes are Professor Baldwin's, save for an addition of my own, properly marked).

At this point, the opening of Chapter iii<sup>13</sup>, Aristotle makes his scientific division of rhetoric by its fields. The three fields of rhetoric are: (1) the *deliberative*, persuasion in public assemblies as to matters of current discussion, looking to the future, urging expediency; (2) the *forensic*, accusation and defense in courts, looking to the past, urging justice; and (3) the *occasional*<sup>14</sup>,

<sup>13</sup>1358 b.

<sup>14</sup>Of the various translations of Aristotle's *ἐπιδεικτικός*, "demonstrative" is flatly a mistranslation, "oratory of display" is quite too narrow a translation, and "epideictic" is not a translation at all. The nearest word in current use is "*panegyric*", which is right as far as it goes. But English use, though it lacks a single equivalent word, is none the less familiar with the thing. The kind of oratory that Aristotle means is the oratory of the Gettysburg Address, of most other commemorative addresses, and of many sermons. The French equivalent is *discours de circonstance*.

<Professor Baldwin, I note, unreservedly condemns 'demonstrative' as a "mistranslation" of *ἐπιδεικτικός*. If he was thinking of 'demonstrative' entirely as an English term, I agree with him without reserve. But, layman though I am, I venture to think the Latin *demonstrativum* not a mistranslation of the familiar Greek term. Witness, first, the passages selected above from Cicero and Quintilian. In fact, from the Roman point of view, since *monstro*, *demonstro*, as applied to persons, were *vores mediae*, capable of conveying now praise, now blame, *demonstrativum* is a very happy reproduction, I think, of the Greek. The Greek and Roman habit of pointing at, in the streets, distinguished characters, or the reverse, is well attested. We have it, for instance, in a famous story told about Vergil by (Donatus =) Suetonius (11): "... si quando Romae, quo rarissime comaeat, viseretur in publico, sectantes demonstrantesque se subterfugeret in proximum tectum. Every one will recall Horace's words, Carm. 4.3.21-23 Totum munus hoc

praise or blame, looking to the present, urging honor. The underlying, general, or "final topics" of rhetoric, as distinct from the special topics that it uses from other studies, are thus seen to be expediency (including practicability), justice, honor, and their opposites; and the special topics drawn by rhetoric from philosophy, ethics, and politics may be grouped in a speaker's compend of these studies according as they apply to the deliberative, the forensic, or the occasional field.

In deliberative oratory<sup>15</sup> the speaker deals with good and bad, not in the abstract as the philosopher contemplates virtue or happiness, but in concrete matters of doubt and dispute. So his topic of possibility is not abstract, as in mathematics, but concrete, in relation to human will. So in general Aristotle disclaims for his classification of the ordinary subjects of deliberative oratory any attempt at scientific division or scientific method of investigation. Those he follows in his other works; here the analysis that he provides is avowedly practical. Since in politics<sup>16</sup>, for example, the public speaker needs to know something of finance, war, commerce, legislation, Aristotle gives him a suggestive summary of what he should learn. In our modern educational systems such a summary has far less importance; but the correlation remains vital. Pedagogically as well as philosophically, deliberative oratory must be correlated with its natural subject-matter. So to-day college courses in rhetoric demand correlation with college courses in history, sociology, economics, and politics. The professors of these subjects train for investigation, teaching the scientific method proper to each; the professor of rhetoric trains for presentation, teaching general methods, Aristotle's general or "final topics", for handling all such material. But unless each method of training can make use of the other, both will suffer. Rhetoric must lean upon such real knowledge of a given subject-matter as is furnished by the studies dealing with that subject-matter scientifically, i. e., by its "special topics". Meantime Aristotle's summary is intended not to explore these special topics, but to show what they are.

Similarly the student of deliberative oratory needs such a survey of philosophy<sup>17</sup> as will acquaint him with current ideas concerning happiness, whether of rank, offspring, wealth, honor, health, beauty, or strength, and concerning a good old age, friendship, fortune, and virtue. Therefore Aristotle, summarizing these conceptions, supplies<sup>18</sup> a cursory examination of good in general and of goods, or good things, in particular, proceeding<sup>19</sup> both by definition and by comparison, and not limiting his discussion to the deliberative field. To the latter, and to politics, he reverts in the concluding chapter<sup>20</sup> of this section by enumerating briefly the common forms of polity: democracy, oligarchy, aristocracy, and monarchy.

Since occasional oratory<sup>21</sup> demands an equipment primarily ethical, Aristotle provides a summary of moral nobility<sup>22</sup> by definition and comparison. This

is applied more specifically than the preceding section to rhetorical method, in this case to the method of enhancing or heightening and to the method of comparison.

For forensic oratory<sup>23</sup> Aristotle provides as a speaker's compend of philosophy a survey of the objects and conditions of crime. He makes no specific mention of what we now call criminal tendencies; and his division of "extrinsic proofs", i. e., of legal evidence (laws, witnesses, contracts, tortures, the oath) is for the modern lawyer neither scientific nor significant.

I trust that I need not point out, in detail, the bearing of all that precedes on the teaching of Latin, in particular of Cicero's orations. I have little patience, as I have intimated before, often enough, with the cry of so many for 'practical' devices, usable in the class-room. In my experience such cries have come, and come, mainly from those who know little Latin, and, unhappily, in all too many instances are unaware of their ignorance of Latin, or at any rate are unaware that *there* rather than in their lack of certain parlor tricks lies their main difficulty. Practical in the highest degree, to my mind, is such a paper as Dr. Riess gave us recently (The Human Side of Certain Latin Authors, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18.49-52), or, I do not hesitate to add, this present paper of mine—highly practical for those, at any rate, who realize that the attempt to apply methods, devices, etc., by one who knows no Latin or little Latin is a most amazing sort of shortsightedness and futility.

What follows is added merely to complete my discussion of the Juvenal passage printed at the head of this paper.

The common reading and punctuation in 165 (*quid do*, with a simple comma before *quid*), I find utterly unintelligible. *quid do* is the reading of the best codex, P, and is supported by the fact that Priscian cites the verse with the reading *quid do*. Divers attempts have been made to explain *quid do*, pointed off as above. These all seem to me unsuccessful. It must suffice to cite one such attempt, that of J. D. Duff:

The *rhetor* speaks, saying he would give anything to oblige the boy's father to listen as often to the wearisome speech. The final clause (*ut . . . audiat*) is to be taken closely both with the imperative clause (*quantum . . . accipe*), and with *quid do*, which is added *asyndetically*. Transl. 'bargain for any sum you please, and I'll pay it on the spot—I'd give anything for his father to hear him as often' as I do myself. *quid do ut . . .* is apparently a colloquial idiom: cf. 3, 184 *quid das* (i. e. you give much) *ut Cossum . . . salutes?*

How in the world is the meaning "I'd give anything for his father to hear him", etc., to be got out of the Latin? An easy alteration is into *quod do*, a form given by most of the MSS., and by the second hand in P itself. This, too, strikes me as feeble. The *rhetor* begins with a full pressure of energy and emotion: 'Name any sum you please, and straightway take. . .'. Take what? We should of course expect him to say, 'and straightway take *that* sum, however huge', instead of which we get, with the reading *quod do*, the passionless 'and take what (ever) I give you'.

<sup>23</sup>Chapters x-xv. 1368 b-1377 b.

tui est, quod monstror digito praetereuntium Romanae fidem lyrae. I am glad to see Professor Clement L. Smith's note, which I had not in mind when I began this addendum to Professor Baldwin's note: "monstror, etc.: a sort of public recognition often alluded to by Greek and Roman writers, in itself of ambiguous significance (cf. Ov. *Am.* III. 6.77) and needing the specification of vs. 23. . .". He adds a reference to Lucian, Herodotus, where we read that, whenever Herodotus appeared in public, people pointed at him, saying, 'That's the famous Herodotus, who sang the song of our victories'.

We may compare also Persius 1.28 *at pulchrum est digito monstrari et dicier 'Hic est'*. With this Conington compares Juvenal 1.161, and the story of "Demosthenes' elation at hearing a poor woman say *Ὀβρός ἐκεῖνος*." C. K. >

<sup>15</sup>Chapter iv. 1359 a.

<sup>16</sup>1359 b-1360 a.

<sup>17</sup>1360 b-1361 b.

<sup>18</sup>Chapter vi. 1362 a-1363 b.

<sup>19</sup>Chapter vii. 1363 b.

<sup>20</sup>Chapter viii. 1366 a.

<sup>21</sup>Chapter ix. 1366 a-1368 a.

<sup>22</sup>*ῥόκαδος*, treated again in Book II from the point of view of the audience.

In The Classical Review 9.29, Professor W. W. Merry proposed *quiddam* for *quid do*. The meaning then is, he says, 'Bargain for as large a sum as ever you please, and take something at once', i. e. as part payment of the *stipulatio*, something on account, to make the bargain binding. Mr. Merry continues:

This seems to give a force to *protinus*, which is generally left without sufficient emphasis. The words are colloquial in style, and the irritated rhetorician may be supposed to say—"You may get any reasonable sum you please, out of me—here, take this to go on with!—on condition", etc. It will be naturally said that we should expect *aliquid* or *partem*, or some such word, and not *quiddam*; and this is a very just criticism. But in the colloquial language of Plautus we find *quiddam* used of something definite, as in *Most.* v.1.53 *est consulere igitur quiddam, quod te cum volo*; *Bacch.* v.2.56 *pudet dicere me tibi quiddam*, where Philoxenus is going to tell the story of his passion.

Unfortunately for Professor Merry, in these two passages *quiddam* has very clearly its ordinary meaning of 'a certain thing whose identity is clearly known to me, the speaker'. Mr. Merry cannot explain a troublesome passage of Juvenal by wrongly interpreting Plautus.

I have a proposal which, I think, will readily explain our passage. Why not keep *quid do*, setting a dash before it, and a question mark after *audiat* (166)? In *quid do. . . audiat*, then, we have an entirely independent question, a deliberative question with the indicative, like *in qua. . . quaero*, 3.296. The thought will then be: 'Name any sum you please and take it straightway < = I'll give it to you at once >.—Come, come, what am I to give in order that. . .'. By supposing that the speaker waits for a reply to *Quantum. . . accipe*, and, getting no answer, breaks out into the impatient *quid do. . . audiat*, we get, without departing one jot or tittle from the best attested reading, a very effective passage, simple, too, to the last degree.

For the value of punctuation as a means of interpretation see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.73 (a discussion of Lucretius 1.1-28, by C. Knapp), and 14.144 (a discussion of Horace, *Carm.* 4. 6.1-28, by R. G. Kent).

CHARLES KNAPP

#### THE VALUE OF BEAUTY AND WONDER IN COMEDY

From the beginning the merriment which we regard as the essence of comedy seems to have been associated with the beautiful and the marvelous. The Dionysus-legend itself has in it no small element of the wonderful. One recalls in the Homeric Hymn the story of the god taken captive by pirates, how he miraculously broke his bands, and how he caused a vine to spring up and twine itself about the mast and the sails, and transformed himself into a lion, and the sailors into dolphins. Of such kind are the primitive tales told of the deity in whose worship comedy as well as tragedy took its beginning. But it is not in Greek comedy alone that the

beautiful and the marvelous are found in union with the jocular, nor, of course, in Aristophanes alone, though one thinks of him first: the combination reappears in English comedy as Shakespeare wrote it. And our suggestion is that beauty and wonder have a universal validity in helping to bring about whatever effect is characteristic of comedy.

In Aristophanes the marvelous obviously is one of the salient features. The heavenward ascent of Trygaeus in the Peace is at once ludicrous and wonderful; the daring conception of Cloudecuckootown in the Birds, and the scene of the Frogs in the shadowy underworld are enough to illustrate the tendency of the comic genius toward the marvelous.

A glance at the Birds will show how the effect of that comedy depends upon a large admixture of the marvelous with the elements of beauty and mirth. Very subtly the poet leads on from the possible to the impossible, from the known to the unknown. It was natural for an Athenian to consult birds of omen whenever he was minded to take upon him some important task; this was a bit of the supernatural familiar in everyday experience. So the play opens with much talk between Euelpides and Peisthetairus over their jackdaw and their crow. One bird leads to another; and thus we are not too suddenly snatched away from reality when the Hoopoe's slave-bird appears, and then the Hoopoe himself, talking freely, and telling of their miraculous origin, a legend, by the way, that was familiar enough to the audience. Thereupon the Hoopoe sings his serenade to the nightingale, an incident at once marvelous, this huge bird singing in human language, and ludicrous—a bird singing a serenade as a human lover might—and beautiful, for even among Aristophanes's lyrics this song is a gem:

Awake! Awake!  
Sleep no more, my gentle mate!  
With your tiny tawny bill,  
Wake the tuneful echo shrill  
On vale and hill—

and the rest, as Frere has translated it. A little later all the birds come fluttering into the orchestra. But by this time we have abandoned ourselves to the poet's magic. He may do anything now. Cloudecuckootown is built, a city in the air, with such a mixture of probable impossibilities that the veriest unrealities seem real. And so the play passes on to its close, with gods descending from heaven, and buffoons and impostors ascending from earth, in a medley of songfulness, jocularly, and wonder such as could be put together only by Aristophanes, and perhaps Shakespeare when his imagination is at its best in poems like *The Tempest* or *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

The *Tempest* is like an Aristophanic comedy purged of political invective and personal abuse. Perhaps of all modern comedies it comes nearest the Birds in the qualities we have been observing. As for details, one might even see a likeness between the parodies of Phrynichus and Aeschylus in the Greek comedy, and an obvious allusion to Greene's *Friar Bacon*, when, in the second act of *The Tempest*, Stephano says: "I was the man i' the moon when time was". In each case the



effect on the audience would be the same; for the Elizabethan public never forgot the Brazen Head, and choruses from tragedy were popular with Athenians as operatic airs are with us to-day. But where *The Tempest* most resembles the Old Comedy is in mingling the beautiful and the marvelous with the ludicrous, for, as we have seen, the Old Comedy combined these three elements in attaining its peculiar comic effect. In *The Tempest* wonder and beauty, on the whole, predominate, yet merriment likewise is everpresent, and takes the lead in those scenes where Stephano and the buffoon Trinculo occupy the stage, and Caliban with his grotesque figure and strange talk.

The incident most purely ludicrous is in the second act, where Trinculo creeps under Caliban's cloak for shelter from the storm, and Stephano, entering drunk, takes the figure thus presented for some novel dicephalous moon-calf: "Four legs and two voices—a most delicate monster!" But Trinculo, recognizing the voice that utters these words, cries out from under the cloak: "Stephano! Stephano! If thou beest Stephano, touch me and speak to me, for I am Trinculo". And the discovery is consummated in a highly ludicrous manner, which to appreciate the reader must turn to the play. It is enough to remark that it is done much after the style of the Athenian Old Comedy. The scene closes with the deception of Caliban, who believes Stephano to be a god come down from the moon, while Stephano for his part, having the rôle of impostor in this way thrust upon him, takes advantage of the mistake for his own ends.

But it is mostly impossible to determine where the ludicrous ends and the beautiful and the marvelous begin, especially when the comic effect is dependent on the diction, and a ludicrous turn of phrase may be anywhere introduced. The comic element is accompanied by wonder—for example, in the ludicrous imitation of Phineus's Feast, where, when a banquet is set before the shipwrecked king and his followers, and they are about to eat, the stage-direction is: "Thunder and lightning. Enter Ariel like a harpy; claps his wings upon the table; and, with a quaint device, the banquet vanishes". Here the effect is one of merriment, by reason of the deception; but the marvelous element also enters.

Caliban is the embodiment of these two elements, the ludicrous and the marvelous; he is a distorted comic figure, and at the same time strange and wonderful.

So the play continually moves in the marvelous. The natural atmosphere of the play, set as the play is in some far-off unknown island of the sea, is charged with enchantment. The poet with superior magic has filched her charms from Circe, and bestowed them, those of one kind on Miranda and the others on Prospero; and all of her monsters together he has transformed into one Caliban. Magic seems to be the natural atmosphere of the island, because of a kind of magic art by which the poet leads his audience on. The storm at sea, with which the play begins, seems in itself natural enough. And when the audience hears that the tempest has been raised by the art of Prospero

they are easy of faith; for a thunderstorm is a kind of miracle readily enough believed in. And so, too, is Miranda's sleep, which is the next effect of her father's powers. In this way, as it were by degrees, we are introduced into that charmed atmosphere, until it seems the most natural thing in the world that the shipwrecked Ferdinand should be on the instant captivated by the spells of Miranda, and charmed from moving by her father's art. We accept the "sweet airs" from unseen minstrels as the proper sounds of the place; and the pageants Prospero conjures up, like a more benignant Faustus, we are prepared to take for the realities of that all so unreal world.

There is an element of wonder in every well-constructed drama, as Aristotle observes in his treatise on poetry. The effect of a tragedy, he says, will best be produced when the incidents come unexpectedly, yet at the same time are caused by one another; since even pure coincidences appear most marvelous if there is something that looks like design in them. To be sure, he is here dealing with tragedy; but, inasmuch as the marvelous has a comic value as well as a tragic, the generalization of the last clause holds good in comedy: 'even pure coincidences appear most marvelous if there is in them something that looks like design'. And it is so in *The Tempest*. Shakespeare, indeed, is so careful to make the most of every chance for the marvelous that he instinctively calls attention to this particular thing, design. Gonzalo says:

Look down, you gods,  
And on this couple drop a blessed crown!  
For it is you that have chalked forth the way  
Which brought us hither. . . .  
Was Milan thrust from Milan that his issue  
Should become kings of Naples? O, rejoice  
Beyond a common joy! and set it down  
With gold on lasting pillars: in one voyage  
Did Claribel her husband find at Tunis,  
And Ferdinand, her brother, found a wife  
Where he himself was lost, Prospero his kingdom  
In a poor isle, and all of us ourselves  
When no man was his own.

If Caliban embodies the ludicrous element of the comedy together with the marvelous, Ariel is the embodiment of the marvelous and the beautiful. The song that he sings in Ferdinand's ear is scarcely surpassed by the song to Sabrina which Milton put into his drama of enchantment. Ariel is associated always with music and light, a bird-like spirit of the skylark kind. Caliban represents comic distortion as against the norm of artistic beauty in Ariel. Both of them are necessary elements in comedy.

The formal beauty of *The Tempest* is evident. The plot is simple and perspicuous, so that the poet finds himself observing the 'unity of time' and, in effect, that of 'place'—a fact which, in the first instance, seems to afford him no little satisfaction, for on three several occasions he calls attention to the whole having come about in three hours, the acting time. The supernatural, prominent as it is for the sake of atmosphere, does not really touch the plot. Ariel, like the gods in the *Iliad*, seems very busy, and is continually before our eyes; but, so far as the plot goes, all follows naturally out of a storm at sea. And so, where the

first scene shows the Master and the Boatswain in despair for their ship, they are introduced again in the last scene with news of her safety, the ship like her passengers having come forth unscathed from her troubles into port. Ariel enters then driving before him Caliban, Stephano, and Trinculo in their stolen apparel, so that to the very end the poet holds his drama to a truly Aristophanic mingling of the beautiful and the marvelous with the ludicrous.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

JAMES HUTTON

### REVIEWS

Compounds of the Word "Horse". A Study in Semantics. By Emily Foulkrod. Philadelphia (1919). Pp. 83.

Compounds of the Word "Cow". A Study in Semantics. By Alfred Porter Hamilton. Philadelphia (1923). Pp. 59.

The titles of these two University of Pennsylvania dissertations are a trifle misleading. The discussion is not confined to English compounds, as might be inferred, but includes also Sanskrit, Avestan, Old Persian, Greek, Latin, and German material. On the other hand, compounds in which the words for 'horse' and 'cow' are final members are not included. The reasons for omitting several Indo-European languages and a large proportion of the compounds in all the languages must have been pedagogical rather than scientific, and it is a question whether it would not have been better for the authors to limit their attention, say, to Sanskrit and Greek, or to English and German, and to make their collections as complete as possible for the languages studied.

Both dissertations classify the material according to a system which was worked out by Dr. Foulkrod. This system is based upon the logical relation between the members of the compounds, without reference to the psychological categories which other linguistic processes show to be prevalent in the several languages studied. Since Dr. Foulkrod intended her system to apply to languages as different in structure as Sanskrit and English, it may be that no other procedure was possible; but that seems to the reviewer one of the reasons why English and Sanskrit compounds should be treated separately.

In Sanskrit and Greek a substantive modifying another substantive is commonly in the genitive case, and consequently all speakers must have felt the prior members of such compounds as *asvahantr*, 'slayer of horses', and *ἵπποδιδάκτης*, 'driver of horses', as standing in a genitive relation to the final members. Dr. Foulkrod would reply (13) that classification by case relation sometimes

... separates identical semantic <more accurately 'logical'> relations. Eng. *horse-rider* is called an instance of genitive relation because both members are nouns; Eng. *horse riding*, because the last member is a gerund which can take a direct object, is classified under the accusative relation; yet the semantic <i. e. logical> relation is really objective in both compounds.

This is true enough of English, and perfectly cogent for any language, if one is thinking of logic, but quite beside the point if the purpose be to get at the feeling of the speakers. As long as the Greeks habitually said *ἵππων δαμαστής* but *ἵππους δάμνησι*, they must have felt the prior element of *ἵπποδαμαστής* as a genitive, while they probably felt the prior element of *ἵπποδάμος* as an accusative. Speakers of Sanskrit must have felt the different case relation implied in *gonāva*, 'leading cows', and *gopa*, 'protecting cows', on the one hand, and in *gopati*, 'lord of cows', and *gopitr*, 'father of cattle', on the other. In spite of minor blemishes Whitney's classification of compounds is still the best for Sanskrit and Greek.

Both of our authors apply their classification with admirable consistency, and it required much clear and careful thinking to do this. Dr. Hamilton, for example, must have been sorely tempted to classify Sanskrit *gavāmpati*, 'lord of cattle', in a way that would justify the genitive case of the prior member, but he had the heroism to list it under the heading "True object: Final member has verbal force".

There is no doubt that both Dr. Foulkrod and Dr. Hamilton have fairly earned their degrees; and, as far as the English and the German material is concerned, the new principle of classification is suggestive. For the earlier Indo-European languages any semantic study which neglects the familiar grammatical categories is likely to go astray.

YALE UNIVERSITY

E. H. STURTEVANT

A Study in the Commerce of Latium, From the Early Iron Age Through the Sixth Century B. C. By Louise E. W. Adams. Smith College Classical Studies, No. II. Northampton, Mass. (1921).

The particular value of this study, a Bryn Mawr doctoral dissertation, lies in its careful analysis of the results of very extensive archaeological investigations and in its reconstruction on this basis of a very interesting phase of Latin civilization in what is, strictly speaking, its prehistoric period. An introductory chapter gives a summary of the traditions respecting Phoenician and Greek commercial enterprise in the western Mediterranean down to the close of the sixth century. Chapter II discusses Civilization in Latium in the Early Iron Age, that is, the period of the *pozze* tombs, to the close of the eighth century. This period is marked by the comparatively poor culture of an almost exclusively agricultural population. In the meantime, Etruria, starting from the same cultural conditions of a primitive Italian people, had gained richness and variety through foreign contacts. This difference is explained by the exploitation of the copper and iron deposits of Etruria. The salt trade passing up the Tiber valley and the importation of metals from Etruria, possibly by way of the site of Rome, formed the chief channels of communication between the Latins and their neighbors in Italy.

Chapter III, The Great Period of Importation, and Chapter IV, The Overland Route from Etruria, are devoted to the seventh century, the epoch character-



ized by the predominance of the *tombe a fossa*. The earlier isolation of Latium had by this time given way to an active intercourse with peoples who introduced the products of the eastern Mediterranean. Phoenician (i. e. Carthaginian), and to a much greater degree, Greek traders frequented the coast of Latium. At the same time the Etruscans established their control of a trade route passing across Latium to Campania by way of Fidenae, Gabii, and Praeneste. This section of Latium had attained the same level of prosperity as Etruria itself and was in advance of the region along the lower Tiber and around the Alban Mount. Chapter V deals with Rome in the sixth century, the period of Etruscan occupation, as revealed by the finds in the characteristic *camera* tombs. The new lords of Rome attempted to develop it as a commercial center, founding a harbor town at Ostia, but its volume of foreign trade was still small in comparison with that of Etruria. Towards the close of the century this commercial activity ceased with the overthrow of Etruscan domination. The archaeological record in this particular finds confirmation in Rome's first commercial treaty, which is discussed in Chapter VI. Dr. Adams accepts 509 B. C. as the date of this treaty with Carthage, and points out that its terms show the very slight interest of the Romans in foreign trade, but their very real interest in securing their political domination over the other Latin towns.

The author does not acknowledge any guidance in this study, and she did not have the opportunity of using Professor Tenney Frank's Economic History of Rome, which appeared in 1920. It is, therefore, interesting to note that her conclusions are in very close agreement with the view presented in Chapter II of the Economic History, which treats the early trade of Latium and Etruria, and may accordingly be considered as confirming this view<sup>1</sup>. Dr. Adams has provided a good bibliography, which follows a topical arrangement.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A. E. R. BOAK

The Greek Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt.

A Study in the History of Civilization. By C. H. Oldfather. University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History, No. 9. Madison, Wisconsin (1923). Pp. viii + 104.

In his Preface, Professor Oldfather has defined his investigation as an attempt "to use the Greek literary texts" found among the papyri "as a basis for a study in the History of Civilization in Greco-Roman Egypt". Chapter I contains the necessary foundation for his study, a carefully compiled list of the literary texts arranged in a convenient table with an indication of the extent of each MS., the century to which it belongs, its place of publication, and, wherever it is known, the place where it was discovered. Here he has had the benefit of Schubart's excellent list (*Einführung in die Papyrskunde*, 472-484), as well as other less complete compilations, but all the items have been carefully

verified and new titles have been added. The result is a new list of 1,167 numbers. And, at that, the author has been unable to include the more recently discovered fragments, as, for example, those of the University of Michigan collection. The second chapter discusses the types of literature and the authors read in the Schools. Here Table I contains the list of the forty authors and collections represented among the papyri which may definitely be assigned to the Schools. Then, after a very plausible presentation of the view that most of the literary papyri found on the *verso* of a used *recto* were probably written for School use, Professor Oldfather presents Table II, which contains an analysis of the general list from this point of view, showing the total number of MSS. of each author, the number written on the *verso*, and the percentage of the total formed by those written on the *verso*. The list of the texts written on the *verso* includes practically all of the authors who appear in Table I, as well as many others who would be suitable for School use. In discussing the papyrus edited by M. Norsa in *Aegyptus* II (1921) as a list of literary desiderata, the writer adduces very good arguments to show that we have here an assignment of works to be read in some School. A third table gives the chronological distribution of the literary texts from the Schools.

The third and final chapter is a study of the chronological distribution and the provenience of all the literary texts, which, in Table IV, are conveniently arranged by authors and centuries, from the third century B. C. to the seventh of our era. A very interesting picture is presented by this list. The Ptolemaic period reveals a comparative dearth of literary interest, which may be accounted for by the absorption of the energies of the Greeks in the exploitation of the resources of Egypt, and, I should like to add, the difficulty which they had in maintaining their supremacy against the rising tide of Egyptian nationalism under the later Ptolemies. Such as they were, the intellectual interests of the time were dominated by the classical tradition of the Greek homeland to the almost total neglect of contemporary authors. Under the Roman peace, intellectual life flourished and its interests broadened very considerably. But from the third century A. D. a rapid decline is apparent, which is to be explained partly by the depressing political and economic conditions, and partly by the demands made by Christianity upon the intellectual activities of the population. The classical tradition, which was dominant even in the Roman period, attains a complete triumph in the Byzantine era. Professor Oldfather's study is a very useful contribution to the field of papyrology. But, as he himself points out, it cannot claim to be definitive, for, as is noted on page 104, a fragmentary library catalogue of the early third century lists twenty-nine works and nineteen authors, of which only one work and four authors are represented in the general list in Chapter I. Fresh discoveries alone will confirm or alter the general conclusions advanced here.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

A. E. R. BOAK

<sup>1</sup>It is worth while, however, to note that Miss Adams had been a graduate student under Professor Frank. C. K.

### THE NEW YORK CLASSICAL CLUB SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATIONS

The twelfth competitive scholarship examination given by The New York Classical Club, on June 14 last, at Hunter College, New York City, resulted in victory for the Morris High School and for Eastern District High School, George S. Elpern of the former winning the Latin Scholarship, Harry Cohen of the latter, the Greek.

These scholarships, of which the Latin was established in 1910, the Greek in 1915, were at first awarded on the basis of the Regents Examination scores made by the candidates. Since 1919, they have been given to the winner of special competitive examinations prepared and marked by a committee of the Club, consisting of teachers of the Classics in the High Schools of New York City. About 75% of each paper is sight work.

The terms on which the scholarships are awarded require that the recipient shall take at least one full year's course in Latin or Greek during his freshman year at College. The amount of the Latin Scholarship is \$150, of the Greek, \$100. An earnest effort is being made to increase the amount of the Greek Scholarship Fund, that the two awards may be equal.

HARWOOD HOADLEY, *Chairman, Committee  
on Award of Scholarships*

### THE AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME FELLOWSHIPS IN THE SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

The American Academy in Rome has announced its annual competition for Fellowships in Classical Studies. There is one Fellowship with a stipend of \$1,000 a year for two years, and one paying \$1,000 for one year. Residence in the Academy is provided free of charge, and food is provided at cost. Opportunity is offered for extensive travel in classical lands, including a trip to Greece. The awards are made by a jury of nine eminent scholars, after a competition which is open to unmarried men or women who are citizens of the United States. Applications will be received until March 1.

Any one desiring to compete must fill out a form of application and file it with the Secretary, together with letters of recommendation. The candidate must also submit evidence of attainment in Latin literature, Greek literature, Greek and Roman history and archaeology, and also ability to use German and French. Published or unpublished papers should be presented to indicate fitness to undertake special work in Rome. The Fellows will be selected by the jury after a thorough consideration of the papers and the other evidence submitted.

For circular of information and application blank address the undersigned, Executive Secretary of the Academy, 101 Park Avenue, New York City.

ROSCOE GUERNSEY

### AN ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY LESSON

It occurred to me that the comparison of the Peloponnesus to the leaf of the plane tree, made by ancient geographers (compare Strabo 2.1.30), might afford a useful exercise for students, if they should be obliged to trace out the agreements on the leaf of the American plane tree (usually called sycamore); but, as this lacks deeply marked lobes, it proved to be unsatisfactory. I then found in examples of the oriental plane tree that, although here also only three ribs radiate from the stem, yet its leaves are distinctly lobate, and so could be made useful. However, the leaves of both the sycamore

maple and the Norway maple are far more serviceable, as the former has five, the latter seven ribs (two of them small) radiating from the stem. It is easy to locate on a Norway maple leaf all the important gulfs and many of the promontories, besides some of the mountain ranges, especially the Taygetus and Parnon. The resemblance is of course fanciful; but the symmetry of the leaf makes the Peloponnesus seem distorted, which impresses its shape on the memory. The stem of the 'Peloponnesus leaf' can be imagined to have been attached to the main land near Naupactus, from which the Dorians were said to have crossed over (compare Pausanias 10.38.10).

GOUCHER COLLEGE

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING

### CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

#### V

American Historical Review—October, Review, in the main favorable, by A. Eustace Haydon, of E. Washburn Hopkins, Origin and Evolution of Religion; Review, by W. Woodburn Hyde, of Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay; Review, by Julius W. Pratt, of Arthur MacCartney Shepard, Sea Power in Ancient History: The Story of the Navies of Classic Greece and Rome; Review, favorable, in the main, by La Rue Van Hook, of W. G. de Burgh, The Legacy of the Ancient World; Review, favorable, by W. Woodburn Hyde, of A. de Ridder and W. Deonna, L'Art en Grèce; Review, favorable, by W. S. Ferguson, of J. B. Bury, E. A. Barber, E. Bevan, and W. W. Tarn, The Hellenistic Age: Aspects of Hellenistic Civilization.

History—July, A Survey of Some Recent Contributions to the Early History of London, A. H. Thomas, Clerk of the Records at Guildhall, London.

Klio, XIX, 2—Streitsätze zur Salamisfrage, Curt Guratzsch; Die Begründung des Hellenistischen Königs Kultes durch Alexander, Paul Schnabel.

Mittheilungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft, 63, Vorhomerische Griechen in den Keilschrifttexten von Boghazköi, Emil Forrer.

Revue Historique—July, Les Artisans et leur Vie en Grèce, VII<sup>e</sup> et VI<sup>e</sup> Siècles, concluding installment, dealing with La Condition Sociale des Artisans, Pierre Waltz.

Journal des Savants—May, Les Inscriptions de Délos, I, P. Roussel.

Teachers College Record—September, On the Sources of the English Vocabulary. A Report on the Latin-English Word Count of the American Classical League, Wren J. Grinstead [26.32-46. The Summary, on page 46, runs as follows. 1. By any system of counting other than unweighted frequency, Latin comprises fully half of the English vocabulary. 2. Outside the very commonest words, the proportion of Latin words tends to diminish slightly as the range of use of words becomes narrower. 3. About one-fourth of the English vocabulary is native. 4. Nearly all the very common words are native. 5. The proportion of native words tends to diminish as the range of use becomes narrower. 6. Greek furnishes about one-tenth of the English vocabulary. 7. The proportion of Greek words tends to increase as the range of use becomes narrower. 8. The proportion of words from non-classical foreign languages tends to increase with a narrowing range of use, except in the decidedly rare words].

CHARLES KNAPP